

Application No.: 10/723653
Docket No.: AD6924USNA

Page 4 of 5

REMARKS**About the Amendments**

The Amendment to Claim 1 recognizes the Examiner's argument with respect to the lack of a clear requirement that the non-acetal component have a lower melt viscosity than the polyacetal component. The Applicants have clarified the claim to explicitly state the relative melt viscosities of the non-acetal and the polyoxymethylene components. The Applicants do not consider this a further limitation of the claims since the added condition was implicit in the original claims, with respect to the reference to adhesion.

Also there is a correction to an error in the claim. The correction does not add new matter, and is supported by the specification at page 8, lines 9-10.

Traversal**35 USC 103(a)**

All pending claims are rejected as obvious. The Examiner maintains all rejections from the previous Action. The Examiner maintains that it is not necessary that the motivation to combine to references be solve the same problems the Applicants were motivated to solve.

The Applicants agree in general with the Examiner's statement, but respectfully disagree with the overall conclusion of the Examiner as applied to the present application. While the motivation to combine the references does not have to be the same as the Applicants' motivation, the finding of obviousness does require that the references offer some guidance in combining the teachings in a way that one of ordinary skill in the art would obtain the Applicants' claimed invention. In the present case, the motivation to combine is very much related to the invention/solution obtained by the Applicants. The Applicants were motivated to solve the problem of a lack of adhesion at the surface of articles comprising POM. The solution to the problem was not just a matter of putting together a combination of polymers. The solution, and thus the invention, relies upon a particular combination that results in having more adhesive character at the surface of what one of ordinary skill would expect to be an otherwise "non-stick" surface. The guidance to combine the components in a manner to improve adhesion is absent from the references. There are numerous ways that the teachings of the references could be followed that would not provide the Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, combining the references – without the motivation of increasing surface adhesion – does not necessarily lead one of ordinary skill to the Applicants' claimed invention. While the motivation to combine may be any that is suggested by the references, it only stands to reason that one of ordinary skill looking to the references to obtain a composition having improved surface adhesion would not be guided to combine the references in the very specific manner provided and required by the Applicants' claims. Therefore the Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not obvious.

With regard to the unexpected results, the adhesive properties of the claimed invention are exemplified in the specification. This improvement is shown relative to comparative examples and is therefore not speculative. There are no such observations of improved

Application No.: 10/723653
Docket No.: AD6924USNA

Page 5 of 5

adhesion to be obtained from the references, presented by the Examiner as the closest prior art. In fact, there is not even a mention of the possibility of improving surface adhesion, and the compositions are said to be suitable for use as lubricants. The evidence is clear, therefore, that the Applicants' results of improved adhesion are surprising in view of the teachings of the closest prior art.

The Examiner points to the polyamide as the non-acetal component relied upon in Kuduo, not the LDPE. However, Kuduo requires the combination of polyamide and LDPE in a ratio of from 10/90 to 90/10 % by weight (see the Abstract), and therefore Kuduo cannot be relied upon for the teaching of polyamide alone. Since the LDPE component is not listed among the selected group of polymers which provide a limitation to the claims, any combination with Kuduo fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness.


Kuduo teaches away from improved surface adhesion by describing a lubricant. This point was raised by the Applicants in the previous response but was not addressed by the Examiner in the Advisory Action. That the references teach away from the presently claimed invention is strong secondary indicia of non-obviousness in the present application.

In view of the Examiner's comments regarding the lack of clarification regarding the relative melt viscosities of the components, the Applicants have clarified the claims to specifically require that the non-acetal component have a lower melt viscosity than the polyacetal component. The amendment specifically addresses the Examiner's contention that the Applicants' argument is not commensurate with the claims.

The references teach acid modification processes that one of ordinary skill would expect should increase melt viscosities of the acid-modified materials relative to the unmodified materials. Therefore any teaching or suggestion to incorporate an acid-modified polyolefin is away from the presently claimed invention since the modified polyolefin would be expected to have a higher melt viscosity and, therefore, migrate away from the POM surface where the improvement to adhesion is desired. Again, the courts have consistently held that teaching away by a reference is a secondary indicia of non-obviousness.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin S. Dobson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,296
Telephone: 302.892.5526
Facsimile: 302.992.3257

Dated: January 15, 2007